APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,196	04/09/2004	Takehiro Kaminagayoshi	418268014US	2318

45979   7590   10/16/2008
PERKINS COIE LLP/MSFT
P. O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER
CHERIYAN JR, THOMAS K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

It has been noted that claims 1, 10, 14, 20, 24, 32, and 36 have been amended

leaving claims 1-40 to be examined for consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/5/2008 have been fully considered but are not

persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that the references combined do not teach

claim 1 as amended which states "receiving a request from a first player to enable gate

crashing in the game, wherein the game is configured in a single player mode." This

argument is somewhat flawed because starting a game in "single player mode" implies

that no other users can join the single player during game play. From an alternative

point of view, it would be obvious to create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one

player thereby allowing other players to "crash" or join the game, whether invited or not

as taught from the combined references of Silvester, Finlayson, and the game Quake.

Simply putting a label of "single player mode" in the claim language does not overcome

the obviousness of these three combined references.

Applicant also argues that that the combined references do not teach or disclose

what is claimed in claim 14 for the argument that the host player or other players may

be "aware" when a player joins the game. This is simply a game design choice that

games such as Quake have implemented. It would be highly obvious to anyone skilled

in the art of gaming at the time of the invention to simply remove any kind of notification

or status message which tells other players in a game when a new player has joined. By

simply making other players unaware that a new player has joined the game and

replaced one of the existing bots in the game is not novel at all. The combined

references successfully teach that a player can join an existing game and transition

control of a character in the game to the second player.

Since all arguments have been address by the Examiner and are now moot, this

rejection is FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Silvester (US 2003/0125112 A1) in view of Finlayson et al (US 2002/0103029 A1) and

the game manual for Quake III Arena

("http://jarcas.dreamhosters.com/rdocs/Quake_III_-_Manual_-_PC.pdf").

Regarding claim 1, Silvester discloses a computer-implemented method for

playing a game, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a first player to enable gate crashing in the game,

wherein the game is configured in single-player mode **(Silvester, Abstract and**

Paragraph 0008. Silvester states that "If the invitation is communicated to the

invitee, the invitee may accept or reject the invitation." From an alternative point

of view, it would be obvious to create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one

player thereby allowing other players to "crash" or join the game.) ;

in response to the request from the first player, transmitting information to a

remote computer **(Silvester, Paragraph 0016 and Figure 2. It would be obvious**

information would be transmitted among a plurality of remote computers to each

other either directly or through a game server as it is commonly known in the

art.);

in response to transmitting the information to the remote computer, receiving a

request from a second player to participate in the game **(Silvester, Abstract)**;

Silvester does not teach the following but Finlayson does:

and

in response to the request from the second player to participate in the game,

transitioning control of a character in the game from a program routine to the second

player **(Finlayson, Summary of Invention. Finlayson teaches that when a user**

leaves a game, an AI bot replaces him until the user comes back. Therefore, it

would be obvious in this case for a user to simply join a game and transition

control of a character in the game from a program routine to the second player.).

The motivation for combining the teachings of Finlayson with Silvester is because both disclosures are related to multiplayer game networks. Even though Finlayson focuses the embodiment of his invention to multiplayer card games, it would be obvious to anyone skilled in the art of gaming to apply Finlayson's methods to other types of games such as RPGs, RTS, First Person Shooters, and so on.

Therefore, it would be obvious to anyone skilled in the art of gaming at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Finlayson with Silvester to achieve a multiplayer game method where a user can crash into a game and replace another character because it would create for better and enhanced game play.

It should also be noted that Silvester does not teach that multiplayer gaming includes can include real players playing with virtual players like Finlayson does. It would be obvious however to combine Finlayson and Silvester with the game of Quake III, a multiplayer first person shooter game because a game or match would not have to end if multiple players leave a game. Instead, players that leave would be replaced with AI bots. In the same respect, a multiplayer game that already has AI bots can be replaced by crashers thereby allowing more real people to play in a game at once as well as keeping the game continuous and refreshing.

Regarding claims 2, 16, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose transmitting information to the remote computer includes transmitting information about the game to the remote computer **(Obvious since games like Quake III are usually hosted on a server where multiple players can connect with each other to play a game. Game**

information is obviously transmitted to all computers connected together in the game.).

Regarding claims 3, 15, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose transmitting information to the remote computer includes transmitting information about the first player to the remote computer **(Obvious since games like Quake III are usually hosted on a server where multiple players can connect with each other to play a game. Game information is obviously transmitted to all computers connected together in the game.).**

Regarding claim 4, 17, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving a request from a second player to participate in the game includes receiving a non-player character selection from the second player **(Silvester, Abstract discuses how a player can receive a request from another player to join a game. Combining this teaching with Finlayson who teaches about replacing non-player characters with a real player in a multiplayer game, it would be obvious then to have a second player to receive a request to join a game which includes receiving a non-player character selection from the second player.).**

Regarding claim 5, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose transitioning control of a character in the game from a program routine to the second player includes transitioning control without signaling the first player **(Silvester teaches that if a crasher wants to crash a game, the host of the game or the first player would be signaled as whether to accept or deny the person. It would then be obvious to have the opposite of this where the host is not aware that the crasher is joining a**

game or not. It should also be noted that in multiplayer games like Quake III, even

though it is not disclosed in the game manual, players have options to turn off

status messages such as when players enter and leave a game. It should also be

noted that in games like Quake III can support public and private game matches

where in a public game match, anyone can crash into the game. With this in mind,

a player can transition control of a character in the game from a program routine

to the second player which includes transitioning control without signaling the

first player.).

Regarding claim 6, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a computer-

implemented method for playing a game, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a first player to initiate the game in single-player mode

(In Quake III you can play the game in single player mode or multiplayer mode.

However, in order to play a game with other real people, you would have to

change the settings to multiplayer mode. It is also possible to play single player

mode which would be simulated online in a network such as playing on server

only with bots. It should be noted that there are classic games which includes

Diablo 2 where players play the game online either by themselves or with other

people.);

receiving a first control input from the first player **(Obvious in view of Silvester,**

Finlayson, and Quake);

controlling a first character in response to the first control input received from the

first player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

controlling a second character in response to computer-readable instructions **(As stated before, the Quake III manual teaches using bots (Quake III Manual, Page 22), so therefore, you are in essence controlling a second or multiple characters in the game.)**;

receiving a request from a second player to control the second character **(Combining the teachings of Silvester and Finlayson, it is obvious for a second player to request to join a game and take control of the second character.).**;

in response to the request from the second player, transitioning control of the second character from the computer-readable instructions to the second player **(Combining the teachings of Silvester and Finlayson, it is obvious for a second player to request to join a game and take control of the second character.)**;

receiving a second control input from the second player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

and controlling the second character in response to the second control input received from the second player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**.

Regarding claim 7, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving a first control input from the first player includes receiving a first control input via a first game console operably connected to a first gaming system, and wherein receiving a second control input from the second player includes receiving a second control input via a second game console operably connected to a second gaming system remote from the first gaming system **(Silvester, Figure 2)**.

Regarding claim 8, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose transitioning control of the second character from the computer readable instructions to the second player includes transitioning control in the absence of notifying the first player **(Finlayson, Summary of Invention. Finlayson teaches that when a user leaves a game, an AI bot replaces him until the user comes back. Therefore, it would be obvious in this case for a user to simply join a game and transition control of a character in the game from a program routine to the second player without notifying the first player.)**.

Regarding claims 9, 19, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving a third control input from the second player;

if the second character is still active in the game, controlling the second game character in response to the third control input received from the second player; and

if the second character is no longer active in the game, controlling a third game character in response to the third control input received from the second player **(Obvious. This is similar to a second player joining a game and replacing a character. Refer to arguments in claim 8 respectively)**.

Regarding claims 10, 20, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a computer implemented method for playing a game, the method comprising:

receiving information about one or more games from a remote computer, wherein the games are configured in single player mode **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake. From an alternative point of view, it would be obvious to**

create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one player thereby allowing other

players to "crash" or join the game);

displaying at least a portion of the received information about the games **(Quake**

III displays all the multiplayer games being hosted in a list in Multiplayer Mode as

seen starting on page 20 of the game manual.);

receiving a request to gate crash at least one of the games **(Silvester teaches**

that if a crasher wants to join a game, the host of the game would receive a

request and either choose to allow or deny the crasher); and

in response to receiving to gate crash, transmitting the request to the remote

computer **(Obvious since the central computer or server would be in control as far**

as who is joining or leaving games during a multiplayer game session.).

Regarding claim 11, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving

information about one or more games from a remote computer includes receiving

information about one or more non-player characters participating in the games, and

wherein the method further comprises receiving a character selection corresponding to

at least one of the one or more non-player characters **(In Quake III in Multiplayer**

Mode, a user can select for example how many bots or non-player characters can

be allowed to play in the game with real players.).

Regarding claim 12, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose sorting the

information about the games, and wherein displaying at least a portion of the received

information includes displaying at least a portion of the sorted information **(The game**

Quake III arena has a "game lobby" where a list of current active games are

currently being played and where lobby information can be sorted based on name

of game, ping/lag time, and so on. This is common in most multiplayer games.).

Regarding claim 13, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose transmitting the

request to gate crash to the remote computer, implementing a peer-to-peer connection

with a remote gaming system **(It is obvious that in a game like Quake III arena, a**

peer-to-peer connection must be established for users on remote computers to

connect to a server to play a multiplayer game.).

Regarding claim 14, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a computer-

readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps

comprising:

receiving a request from a first player to enable gate crashing in a game

(Silvester, Abstract and Paragraph 0008. Silvester states that "If the invitation is

communicated to the invitee, the invitee may accept or reject the invitation.");

in response to the request from the first player, transmitting information to a

remote computer **(Silvester, Paragraph 0016 and Figure 2. It would be obvious**

information would be transmitted among a plurality of remote computers to each

other either directly or through a game server as it is commonly known in the

art.);

in response to transmitting the information to the remote computer, receiving a

request from a second player to participate in the game **(Silvester, Abstract); and**

in response to the request from the second player to participate in the game,

transitioning control of a character in the game from a program route to the second

player, wherein the first player is not aware of the second player's participation in the

game, and wherein the first player is not alerted to which character the second player

controls **(Finlayson, Summary of Invention. Finlayson teaches that when a user**

leaves a game, an AI bot replaces him until the user comes back. Therefore, it

would be obvious in this case for a user to simply join a game and transition

control of a character in the game from a program routine to the second player. It

would be highly obvious to anyone skilled in the art of gaming at the time of the

invention to simply remove any kind of notification or status message which tells

other players in a game when a new player has joined. By simply making other

players unaware that a new player has joined the game and replaced one of the

existing bots in the game is not novel at all.).

Regarding claim 18, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the first player

controls a first character, and wherein transitioning control of a character in the game

from a program routine to the second player includes transitioning control of a second

character, and wherein the steps further comprise:

receiving a first control input from the first player via a first game console

operably connected to a first gaming system **(Silvester, Figure 2 shows several**

computer systems or game consoles hooked up to a network for a multiplayer

game such as Quake III);

controlling the first character in response to the first control input received from

the first player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

receiving a second control input from the second player via a second game

console operably connected to a second gaming system remote from the first gaming

system **(It would be obvious that a second player using a second control input via**

a second game console which is remote from the first game system as seen in

Silvester, Figure 2.); and

controlling the second character in response to the second control input received

from the second player **(Finlayson, Abstract and Summary of Invention teaches a**

second player taking control of a second character to join a multiplayer game.).

Regarding claim 21, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving

information about a game includes receiving information about a console-based game

(Obvious since games like Quake III were made for multiple systems such as PC,

Mac, and so on. It should be noted that a regular PC can be treated as a game

console since a game console and a pc both have the same components to allow

a user to play games.).

Regarding claim 22, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose receiving

information about a game includes receiving information about a console-based game

(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake), and wherein receiving a

request from the second gaming system to join the console-based game includes

receiving a character selection from the second gaming system **(Obvious in view of**

Quake III and Finlayson.).

Regarding claim 23, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the steps further

compromise:

transmitting information about the game to a third gaming system **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Figure 2.)**;

receiving a request from the third gaming system to join the game **(Obvious. Games like Quake III support multiple users requesting to join a game.)**; and

in response to receiving the request from the third gaming system, establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the first and third gaming systems **(Obvious. Quake III can support peer-to-peer connections between multiple gaming systems.)**.

Regarding claim 24, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a computer-based system for implementing a game, the system comprising:

means for receiving a request from a first player to allow control of a game character to be transitioned from a program routine to a remote player **(Combining the teachings of Finlayson and Silvester respectively, it would be obvious that when a user requests to join a game, the player hosting the game would accept that remote player and allow him to take over a non-player character in the current game.)**.

means for transmitting game-related information to a remote computer in response to the request from the first player, wherein the game is configured in single-player mode **(Obvious in view of Sylvester, Finlayson, and Quake III respectively. From an alternative point of view, it would be obvious to create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one player thereby allowing other players to "crash" or join the game.)**; and

means for receiving a request from a second player to participate in the game in response to transmitting the information to the remote computer **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**.

Regarding claim 25, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the means for receiving a request from a first player include means for receiving a request from a first player to allow control of a game character to be transitioned from a program routine to a remote player during the game without the knowledge of the first player **(Combining the teachings of Finlayson and Silvester respectively, it would be obvious that when a user requests to join a game, the player hosting the game would accept that remote player and allow him to take over a non-player character in the current game.)**.

Regarding claim 26, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the first player controls a first game character, and wherein the system further comprises means for enabling the second player to control a second character in response to the request from the second player to participate in the game **(Obvious in view of Sylvester, Finlayson, and Quake III respectively)**.

Regarding claim 27, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the first player controls a first game character **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**, and wherein the system further comprises means for transitioning control of a second character from a program routine to the second player **(Finlayson teaches how a second character from a game can be transitioned to a second player joining the game)**.

Regarding claim 28, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the means for receiving a request from a second player to participate in the game include means for receiving a character selection from the second player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**.

Regarding claim 29, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the following:

means for receiving a first control from the first player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

means for controlling a first character in response to the first control input received from the first player **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

means for controlling a second character in response to computer-readable instructions **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake)**;

means for controlling the second character in response to the second control input received from the second player**(Finlayson teaches how a second character from a game can be transitioned to a second player joining the game. This part of the claim can also be interpreted as just a second player joining a game and controlling a second character which is also obvious in view of Quake III and all other previous multiplayer games.).**

Regarding claim 30, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose means for establishing a peer-to-peer connection between a first gaming system on which the first player is playing and a second gaming system on which the second player is playing **(Highly obvious in view of the game Quake III)**.

Regarding claim 31, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the means for transmitting game-related information include means for transmitting information about a console-based game from a first gaming system to a second gaming system **(Highly obvious in view of the game Quake III).**

Regarding claim 32, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a computer-readable medium including a screen display **(Obvious that the game system such as PC for playing a game like Quake III would have a display)**, the screen display comprising:

at least one gate crasher selection field configured to receive an input from a first user, wherein the first user input enables control of at least one character in a related game to be transitioned from a program routine to a second player, wherein the related game is originally configured in single-player mode **(Combining the teachings of Finlayson and Silvester respectively, it would be obvious that when a user requests to join a game, the player hosting the game would accept that remote player and allow him to take over a non-player character in the current game. In quake III for example, the host has options for certain settings such as the total number of people allowed to play in a game at once, how many bots can be playing at once, and so on. From an alternative point of view, it would be obvious to create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one player thereby allowing other players to "crash" or join the game.).**

Regarding claim 33, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the screen display further comprises:

at least one gate crasher attribute field configured to receive a user input

establishing at least one attribute of potential gate crashes in the related game

(Obvious in view of Silvester who teaches about gate crashing since it would be

obvious to have a field configured to receive a user input.).

Regarding claim 34, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the screen

display further comprises:

a gate crasher skill level field configured to receive a user input establishing a

skill level of potential gate crashers in the related game **(Silvester, Paragraph 0018**

teaches that a host can select the level of difficulty in the game. It would be

obvious then that a users are at a certain skill level while playing a game.).

Regarding claim 35, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose the screen

display further comprises:

a gate crasher alias field configured to receive a user input identifying an alias of

at least one potential gate crasher in the related game **(Obvious since users in the**

game Quake III among other multiplayer games can set up user/alias names for

themselves while playing games online with other people).

Regarding claim 36, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a screen

display, the screen display comprising:

at least one gate crasher selection field configured to receive a user input, herein

the user input enables the user to assume control of a character being controlled by a

program routine in a related game being played on a remote gaming system, wherein

the related game was originally configured in single-player mode **(Combining the**

teachings of Finlayson and Silvester respectively, it would be obvious that when a user requests to join a game, the player hosting the game would accept that remote player and allow him to take over a non-player character in the current game. In quake III for example, the host has options for certain settings such as the total number of people allowed to play in a game at once, how many bots can be playing at once, and so on. From an alternative point of view, it would be obvious to create a "multiplayer mode" game with just one player thereby allowing other players to "crash" or join the game).

Regarding claim 37, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose one or more fields configured to receive game filtering criteria **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake).**

Regarding claim 38, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a game type field configured to receive a user input indicating a type of game the user desires to crash **(Obvious. Quake III displays all active multiplayer games a user may wish to crash.).**

Regarding claim 39, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose a skill level field configured to receive a user input indicating a skill level of host players with which the user wishes to compete **(Silvester, Paragraph 0018 teaches that a host can select the level of difficulty in the game. It would be obvious then that a users are at a certain skill level while playing a game.).**

Regarding claim 40, Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake III disclose an alias field configured to receive a user input indicating an alias of a host player with which the user wishes to compete **(Obvious in view of Silvester, Finlayson, and Quake).**

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas K. Cheriyan whose telephone number is 571-270-3225. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30AM-5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Jones can be reached on (571)272-4438. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott E. Jones/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714